



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,910	10/13/1999	SIMON JOSHUA JACOBS	TI-28505	6758

23494 7590 09/11/2003

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

THEXTON, MATTHEW

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/416,910

Applicant(s)

JACOBS, SIMON JOSHUA

Examiner

Matthew A. Thexton

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Klonis, et al. (US 5939785) in view of Matsuoka, et al. (JP60129139A), as understood from the translation, and Shores (US 5591379).

The reference, Klonis, et al., has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

The Klonis reference discloses all of the features of the claims including the device and methods of preparing with the exception of: (1) Klonis suggests a polymer generally, and a sole species polyvinyl butyral specifically, for a binder; (2) Klonis suggests a desiccant generally and "an alumino-silicate" specifically; and (3) Klonis does not provide any guidance for proportions of desiccant to polymer.

The claims require (1) polymer binder selected from the group consisting of polysaccharides, polyamines, polysulfones, and polyamides, (2) dependent claims

Art Unit: 1714

require the desiccant/drying agent is molecular sieve (claims 2, 15) or zeolite (claims 3, 16), and (3) a proportion of desiccant relative to polymer at a ratio of from 2.1 to 100.

JP '139 discloses desiccant compositions for electronic devices comprising zeolite and heat resistant polymer (urethane resin or polyvinyl alcohol) in a weight proportion of zeolite to polymer of from 3 to 4 (page 3 of translation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the desiccant of JP '139 in the particular electronics devices disclosed by Klonis because the two references are solving the same problems and use of the zeolite/urethane composition would obtain the benefits described in JP '139.

Shores discloses desiccant compositions comprising zeolite and polymer binder for hermetically sealed electronic devices, wherein the polymer may be thermoplastic such as polysulfone, or polyurethane (column 3, lines 52- 57) in a proportion of zeolite to polymer of from 0.002 to 2 by volume. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to employ the polymers suggested by Shores as a viable substitute for the polymers of Klonis or Klonis in view of JP '139 because it solves the same problem and offers the benefits described, in particular to be effective at high conditioning and operating temperatures for the zeolite and the electronic equipment, which is also a goal of both Klonis and JP '139.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-53 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 1714

5939785 (Klonis, et al.) in view of Matsuoka, et al. (JP60129139A), as understood by the translation, and Shores (US 5591379).

For the sake of brevity, the immediately preceding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is incorporated here by reference thereto.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10, 14-23, 27, 31,32, 35-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace, et al. (US 5610438) in view of Matsuoka, et al. (JP60129139A), as understood by the translation, and Shores (US 5591379).

Wallace discloses the micromechanical device and the water getter and the passivating technique using a monomolecular layer of PFDA. The water getter is different from the claims in that the non-evaporable getter is a metal or metal alloy. Likewise, the methods of assembling and activating the device with this getter are specific to this type of getter.

JP '139 discloses desiccant compositions for electronic devices comprising zeolite and heat resistant polymer urethane resin in a weight proportion of zeolite to polymer of from 3 to 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ zeolite in a binder (urethane is a polyamide) as a viable substitute for the metal getter of Wallace because it solves the same problem and offers the benefits described including flexible handling characteristics, or may be considered an equivalent in utility and therefore selected for ordinary economic or engineering considerations.

Art Unit: 1714

Shores discloses desiccant compositions comprising zeolite and polymer binder for hermetically sealed electronic devices, wherein the polymer may be polysulfone, polyurethane (column 3, lines 52- 57) in a proportion of zeolite to polymer of from 0.002 to 2 by volume. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to employ the polymers suggested by Shores as a viable substitute for the metal getter of Wallace or the getter combination of Wallace in view of JP '139 because it solves the same problem and offers the benefits described, in particular to be effective at high conditioning and operating temperatures for the zeolite and the electronic equipment, which is also a goal of both Wallace and JP '139.

The method steps of preparing these types of desiccant mixtures comprising polymer and desiccant agent and incorporating them into electronic equipment are well known.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4 August 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in the prior art suggesting the combination proposed by the Examiner. However, the statements of rejection do set forth the rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures as proposed. The substitution of one thing for another when both are known (disclosed) for the same use is prima facie obvious.

Applicant asserts that none of the references show, teach or suggest "a desiccant able to reversibly absorb a carboxylic acid passivation material" as recited in

Art Unit: 1714

each of the independent claims. Applicant then states that Klonis teaches a material time-releasing the passivant within the enclosure. This assertion is unconvincing for the following three reasons. (1) The mere statement of intended use is not a positive limitation to the presence of the passivant. Only claims 11-13, 24-26, 28-30, 33, 34, and 51-53 positively recite the passivant. (2) Klonis discloses the time-release passivant, which is time-released from the molecular sieve/binder. Since the passivant is first impregnated and then released, it is clearly "reversibly" absorbed. (3) The methods claimed and disclosed by Applicant are substantially identical to those of Klonis (column 6, lines 14-46) and therefore the conditioning must inherently achieve the same result and thus be "able to reversibly absorb."

Klonis discloses that alumino-silicates (of which zeolites are one) held in a thermoplastic binder may absorb a volatile passivant material such as PFDA. It would be immediately apparent to one of ordinary skill that the zeolite/thermoplastic desiccant materials of Matsuoka and Shores would perform in substantially the same way with substantially the same result.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew A. Thexton whose telephone number is 703-305-5085. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasudevan S Jagannathan can be reached on 703-306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

Art Unit: 1714

are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5665.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MA Thexton".

Matthew A. Thexton
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714